

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 11/5/18

TITLE: 952-956 Spaight St - Exterior Alteration in  
the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th  
Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: William Fruhling, Acting Preservation  
Planner

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 11/13/18

**ID NUMBER:** 53566

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, and Marsha Rummel. Excused was David McLean.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Ben Fritz, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Richard Fritz, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

Fruhling said that the work to replace a window on the side of the house with glass block was done without a building permit and without a Certificate of Appropriateness. He said that the glass block was placed within the existing window opening and the trim was also retained. He mentioned that the applicant is also seeking approval to replace a solid non-original door, which is also located on the side of the house. Fruhling said that the only Third Lake Ridge ordinance standard that applies in this case is 41.23(9)(a), regarding visual compatibility and the rhythm of mass and spaces, because the window and door are not located on the street façade. He pointed out that the glass block is not historically appropriate, but he didn't feel there was a standard that would not allow it.

Levitan asked why the work was done without a building permit and Certificate of Appropriateness, and B. Fritz said that he was under the impression that it was considered general maintenance because they did not change the dimensions of the window. He explained that they chose to use glass block because the entrance to their neighbor's house is directly across from the window, and they wanted to provide privacy while still letting light in.

Rummel asked for clarification on what work they have already done versus what they plan to do. B. Fritz said that they are seeking approval for the glass block window, which is already done, as well as the door replacement, which has not been completed yet. He said that Building Inspection has told them they need to replace the door, so they are seeking approval beforehand. Kaliszewski asked if the new door will be similar in appearance to what is already there. B. Fritz said that the new door looks similar and is the same dimensions, explaining that the current door is not original.

Andrzejewski pointed out that the street façade is different than it being visible from the street, and in this case, the standards only reference the street façade. Kaliszewski said that she doesn't feel the glass block window has the same rhythm as what was there previously. Andrzejewski said that regarding the rhythm, she is keeping in mind that it is reversible. Arnesen pointed out that the window opening has not changed, and asked what room the window is in. B. Fritz said that it is currently a bathroom, but had previously been a bedroom

that was unusable because of how exposed it was with the large window; the glass block has now made the room a usable bathroom.

There was brief discussion about the ordinance standards and the ordinance revision process that is currently underway.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Andrzejewski, to retroactively approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacement and to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the door replacement. The motion passed by voice vote, with Kaliszewski voting opposed.**